

III. REMARKS

The Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 103-110 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 47-54 of co-pending Application No. 09/618,480. Applicants note that claims 47-54 of the co-pending application were cancelled in a December 14, 2003 Reply to Non-Final Office Action Dated 8/14/03. Accordingly, this rejection is now moot.

Claims 111-112 have been provisionally rejected for obviousness-type double-patenting as being unpatentable over claims 55, 57, 60 and 61 of co-pending Application No. 09/618,480. In response, Applicants file herewith a Terminal Disclaimer to Obviate a Provisional Double-Patenting Rejection Over a Pending Second Application. Please note that the present application, and co-pending Application No. 09/618,480 were assigned from Interactive Silicon, Inc. to Austin IP Acquisition, Inc., which subsequently changed its name to Quickshift, Inc. The appropriate documentation reflecting these assignments and name change are being recorded. A copy of the documents being recorded through separate filings, is submitted herewith.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 1-51 and 72-112 are allowable over the art of record.

Claims 52, 55, and 56 were rejected over 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,778,255 to Clark. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

With regard to the rejection of claims 52 and 55, Applicants respectfully submit that Clark does not teach all of the limitations of these claims, as is required by a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). In particular, Clark does not teach "parallel decompression," as is set forth in claims 52 and 55. Instead, what Clark teaches is "decompressing multiple data bytes during each machine cycle within the data processing system." Col. 3, lines 10-11. In Clark, the "output buffer is filled once per machine cycle with at least N Newly decompressed bytes." Col. 3, lines 34-36. Clark further

provides that "the method and system for decompressing compressed data described above according to the present invention allows for fast decompression of data that has been compressed with a Lempel-Ziv-type compression algorithm because the present invention does not require that the history buffer be updated one byte at a time." Col. 16, lines 37-48. Applicants submit that decompressing multiple data bytes during each machine cycle as is described in Clark, is not parallel decompression, as set forth in claims 52 and 55. Applicants further submit that the Examiner has not cited to any teachings in Clark that demonstrate that its decompression engine decompresses in a parallel fashion per Applicants' claimed invention.

As set forth in Applicants' patent application, the novel parallel decompression system and method of the claimed invention is "designed to process stream data in more than a single byte or symbol (character) *at one time*." Page 15, lines 16-19 (emphasis added). As further described in Applicants' patent application: "in general, information for decompressing more than one token may be loaded into a stage, operations of the stage performed on the tokens, and the results for all the tokens may be then latched out of the stage into a pipe register for processing in the next stage. In each stage, there may be copies of the logic for performing substantially simultaneous operations 'in parallel' on a plurality of inputs." See page 87, line 29 – page 88, line 3. Since the Examiner has not cited to any teachings in Clark that provide for parallel decompression, especially parallel decompression as described in Applicants' patent application, claims 52 and 55 should be allowed over this art.

With regard to claim 55, please note that Applicants have amended this claim to make it dependent on claim 53, instead of claim 52. Accordingly, since claim 53 was not rejected in view of the Clark patent, amended claim 55 should also be allowable over Clark.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at (512) 370-2858.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael P. Adams
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 34,763

P.O. Box 50784
400 North Ervay St.
Dallas, TX 75201

CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on January 14, 2004.



Signature

AUSTIN_1\238316\1
40532-P001M6D1 01/14/2004